

May 10, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Extensions of Remarks

E 2459

and American capacity to produce grain and other foodstuffs. Japan and the United States have demonstrated great economic strength (current recessions notwithstanding), and China has the potential and the will for comparable economic development. Both private high-level talks between Americans and the Chinese and official Chinese statements make it clear that China's current domestic struggle will not be allowed to interfere with economic development.

American private firms now are negotiating massive transactions with China, relating to Chinese oil and other commodities. One of these negotiations, if consummated, would mean a deal initially paying the American side about \$7 billion, and later developing approximately \$13 billion for American suppliers during the few years of manufacturing and supply. Massive further benefits to both sides would follow.

Japanese firms also are negotiating deals with the Chinese in addition to current trading arrangements.

Such trades—American oil-drilling and processing equipment in exchange for marketing participation in some of the Chinese oil, for instance—provide a solid economic foundation for cooperation in other fields.

Taiwan usually has been the issue that has hampered closer relations between Washington and Peking. But senior Chinese contacts, including some who are close to recently designated Acting Premier Hua Kuofeng, have indicated to me that this issue can be put behind us.

Basically, the Chinese urge American to adopt the "Japan formula"—that is, to acknowledge that Peking has de jure jurisdiction over Taiwan, revoke our 1954 defense treaty with Nationalist China, and withdraw U.S. forces and advisers from the island. That would return U.S. policy at the position taken originally by President Truman before the outbreak of the Korean War. The way then would be cleared for the United States to close its embassy on Taiwan (perhaps maintaining a consular or liaison office for nongovernmental business, as Japan does), and to set up an American embassy in Peking. China would have its embassy in Washington.

In exchange, China has indicated it will give formal open assurance that it would not seek to take Taiwan by force (an operation for which it may not be well equipped militarily at this time in any case), or would work out a formula by which Taiwan would be declared a zone of peace, free from military danger from any source, including Peking. (The Chinese occasionally have hedged on what they would do in return—evidently to reserve bargaining options—and have been more forthright in informal talks with unofficial Americans than with government officials).

In addition, these same high-level sources have indicated to me that China may be willing to give the United States assurances that Taiwan's extensive business with Western countries can continue as before—that all American and Japanese investments there would be safe. I believe the Chinese use of the word "may" was intended to retain bargaining position, and that business-as-usual on Taiwan can be ensured in such an arrangement.

If the Chinese are in earnest on this and the other points of their proposal, the United States is being presented with a foreign policy choice which could affect the world balance for years to come.

Most of this discussion has dealt with U.S.-China interests. But the role of Japan would be a major one—strategically, politically and economically. Japan may be emerging into a new international maturity after decades of following the American lead. The Lockheed affair has cast a cloud over Washington-Tokyo relations, and a positive ap-

proach to a tripartite Pacific partnership could be a wholesome corrective.

It may be too much to expect that our government can rapidly take the steps to make sure exactly what the Chinese are offering and would want in return, to negotiate the many details, and begin to make decisions. But it is not too much to expect that China's proposed Pacific triumvirate be made part of our public discussion—and of our political debate during the presidential campaign.

The American people at least should pick up the Peking hot line, which has been ringing unanswered for several months, and try to understand and evaluate the muffled message from the Chinese. Perhaps the Nixon trip to Peking will help call attention to the ringing and encourage us to engage in a public dialogue.

Then with the issues out in the open and a fresh or renewed administration in Washington early next year, we may be prepared to decide whether the road to world peace through strength runs through Tokyo and Peking.

NOTIFY THE VICTIMS

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the Government Information and Individual Rights Subcommittee, which I chair, has begun hearings on H.R. 12039, H.R. 13192, and H.R. 169. These bills would require that the victims of such illegal and improper programs as COINTELPRO—an FBI program, CHAOS—CIA, burglaries—FBI and CIA, mail openings—FBI and CIA, cable interceptions—National Security Agency, and the special service staff of the IRS be notified that they were targets or victims of these activities, told of their rights under the Privacy Act and the Freedom of Information Act, and afforded the option of having the unlawfully gathered files destroyed.

One victim of questionable activities on the part of our intelligence agencies was Dr. Corliss Lamont, a man who has long been a fighter for peace and social justice. A recent article in the Westside, an excellent weekly newspaper published in my district, sets forth some of Dr. Lamont's experiences with these agencies:

WHAT THE FBI FILE HAD TO SAY

(By Bruce Buckley)

Corliss Lamont was hardly surprised at the news that the FBI had been keeping a file on him: After all, he had been a target of congressional investigating committees, and it was no secret that agents of the Bureau often poked into his private affairs—from interrogating the elevator operator at his West Side apartment house to trying to dissuade publishers from printing his books. What's more, for eight years during the fifties Lamont had been denied a passport because the government thought his traveling abroad was somehow contrary to the country's interests.

But if the existence of the FBI file wasn't startling, the extent of it was. Under the Freedom of Information Act, the former Columbia University philosophy professor began efforts a year ago to obtain copies of the file's contents.

Last May, Lamont's lawyer, Leonard

Boudin, received a letter from FBI director Clarence M. Kelley in which Kelley referred to the size of the file. It amounted to 1800 pages.

Shortly thereafter Lamont's lawyer managed to obtain copies of 274 of those pages. The rest were withheld on the ground that they had to be, in Kelley's words, "kept secret in the interests of national defense or foreign policy." Lamont is still contesting that decision.

Of the pages that he did receive, a good deal turned out to be rather tame stuff indeed—a list of his books in the public library, transcripts of radio talks and printed articles, his entry in Who's Who, a list of the countries he had visited after he fought for and obtained his passport.

One item of the file that Lamont particularly relished was the record of an FBI interrogation of Kenneth Galbraith at the time Galbraith was appointed Ambassador to India in 1961.

"They put him on the spot because he had in the past lived in the same apartment house with me when we were both teaching at Columbia."

Lamont chuckled. "When the FBI was trying to establish there was guilt by co-habitation," he said, adding that the Bureau's agents never approached Jacob Javits, who lived in the same Riverside Drive apartment house.

"At about the same time as the Galbraith business," Lamont said, "my elevator operator stopped me one day and said, 'You know, the FBI has been around asking questions about you. They want to know what you say going up in the elevator.' As if I was going to carry on a propaganda lesson for the elevator man, you know."

Lamont sighed and paused. "It was all such trivial, useless information. And such a waste of manpower."

There was a mixture of amusement and exasperation in his tone as he discussed the case in his cluttered study one recent afternoon. Behind him, the view through the windows of his 15th-floor apartment stretched northward to Columbia, the George Washington Bridge and the Palisades.

At the age of 74, Lamont is white-haired and his face is deeply lined, but he remains youthful and vigorous, the result, he said, of skiing in Colorado, tennis and hikes on the Palisades.

Lamont's most recent published work is a collection of essays going back a half century called "Voice in the Wilderness." He has now begun an autobiography of which the FBI incident will form one chapter.

The Nation recently published Lamont's account of the FBI encounter in an article titled "What the FBI Had On Me." In it, Lamont referred to the more pertinent of the file's contents:

"The most serious part of the documents deals with the Bureau's weird attempts to prove that I was a member of the Communist Party, an organization that I never dreamed of joining. In this unceasing attempt, the FBI relied primarily on various ex-Communist perjurers."

In the article, Lamont also surmised that the rest of the file probably records "even worse invasions of my privacy, one of which I know for certain from other sources: every month for many years FBI agents visited my bank to scrutinize my canceled checks, copies of which the bank later sent to the Bureau."

In addition to the FBI file Lamont has also obtained about 300 pages from the file kept on him by the Central Intelligence Agency. Lamont said they consisted almost entirely of correspondence he carried on while in the Soviet Union as well as letters he had written to "professional contacts" in that country.

Why had so much energy been focused on him?

May 10, 1976

"I think," he said, "they were on the trail of every American who was a little left of center. They were suspicious that he was going to conspire for revolution, bombing or something like that."

Lamont conceded that that might be a bit of an exaggeration, but added: "In my case I was articulate about it. I wrote a lot and one of the things I was particularly concerned about was American-Soviet cooperation."

While even Richard Nixon would later embrace that idea, Lamont pointed out that at the time he was espousing it, it was still considered dangerous.

Moreover, Lamont was visiting the Soviet at a time when its relations with the U.S. were still icebound. Lamont also advocated the cause of Democratic socialism as a solution to economic problems and in his civil liberties work, he said, he was continually defending "the rights of Communists, Trotskyites, all kinds of queer leftists and strange people, just as a matter of principle."

While Lamont's "threat" seems to have been most potent in the realm of ideas, it is not hard to understand why he should have caught the interest of the intelligence-gathering community in the anti-communist hysteria of the late forties and fifties.

In recent years, Lamont thinks the political atmosphere has improved considerably over those murky days. He said that the American people and Congress have become "fed up" with the FBI and the CIA as a result of the disclosures of the last two or three years.

"I do think that some restrictive laws are going to be put through," he said, "although I'm afraid Congress isn't going to go far enough."

Lamont's family background is a strange one for a man who was to embrace so many radical causes. His father, Thomas W. Lamont, was a partner in J.P. Morgan and Company and amassed a considerable fortune.

"Oh, he lived long enough to be shocked by me," said Lamont, "but I don't think he was really shocked."

Lamont explained that his father and mother, who earned a Master's degree in philosophy from Columbia in 1898 and was later to become one of the university's largest benefactors, "voted Republican most of the time, but they were liberals."

"They were the ones who got me interested in international affairs—the League of Nations and the U.N."

Dinners in the Lamont household were a time for wide-ranging discussions, and, according to Lamont, there was always "an atmosphere of tolerance" during these talks.

Dinner guests might include H.G. Welles or John Masefield. "H.G. was always much more radical than I," Lamont recalled. "And there he would be right in the middle of the family dinner expounding socialist ideas. I was brought up in that kind of milieu."

Lamont said he often agreed with his parents on issues. "There was plenty we had in common. They supported civil liberties and world peace and trade union organization..."

Did they support democratic socialism?

"Oh, no," he said, "they never came over to socialism."

TWO HUNDRED YEARS AGO TODAY

HON. CHARLES E. WIGGINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1976

Mr. WIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago today, on May 10, 1776, the Continental Congress adopted a resolution recommending to the assemblies and

conventions of the United Colonies that those Colonies without a government should establish governments most conducive "to the happiness and safety of their constituents in particular, and America in general." John Adams, Edward Rutledge, and Richard Henry Lee were appointed to a committee to prepare a preamble to the resolution.

The importance of the resolution in America's move toward independence was underscored by Adams, who wrote in his autobiography:

This resolution I considered as an epochal, a decisive event. It was a measure which I had invariably pursued for a whole year, and contended for, through a scene and a series of anxiety, labor, study, argument, and obloquy. . . .

to the point of almost non-existence, air service becomes even more vital to the smaller city. Particularly is it vital to the more remote cities from the large centers of population if the smaller areas hope to foster industrial growth.

The Ford administration proposal would help the commuter air lines with subsidies. Such a program was tried with Air Midwest which is serving cities that Frontier Airlines did not want to serve. Frontier was collecting the subsidy but passing it along to Air Midwest. This was stopped by a U.S. Circuit Court ruling, but the matter was reconsidered recently by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Under the Ford program the subsidy would go direct to the small airline which takes over service from the large airline.

Since the new proposal has to get through Congress it may take a while, but it should be of benefit to many Kansas cities in the future.

REGULATORY REFORM OF THE AIRLINES

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1976

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, on October 8, 1975, President Ford sent to Congress proposed legislation to improve the economic regulation of domestic airlines. Subsequently this proposal was introduced in the House as H.R. 10261 by Representative ROBERT JONES, WILLIAM HARSHA, and GLENN ANDERSON, and referred to the House Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

This regulatory reform proposal had raised some concern in small communities that abandonments would accelerate. While advocates of the measure have denied this, I am nonetheless pleased that the administration has also recommended an amendment to the bill which would assure small communities of air service through a subsidy program.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that within the last two decades almost 200 cities have lost CAB certificated air service through abandonment. The current system does not, therefore, offer any assurance that additional smaller communities will not also be abandoned. As trunk and regional air carriers move to larger and more sophisticated aircraft the likelihood of further abandonment increases for the reason that it is less economical to serve such communities with these larger aircraft. I am pleased, therefore, to note the Ford administration initiative on the small communities subsidy issue and hope the House Public Works Subcommittee on Aviation will explore this problem in its hearings on the Aviation Act of 1975 which began on May 5, 1976.

I insert a Great Bend Tribune editorial of March 30, 1976, in the RECORD:

A Boost for Air Service

Small commuter airlines will get a big boost under a new proposal by the Ford administration. A subsidy program for the airlines who serve the small cities is proposed.

There is merit in the proposal because of the importance of air service to smaller communities such as those served by Air Midwest. With the decline in rail transportation

POST EDITORIAL OPPOSES SECTION 404 CHANGE IN H.R. 9560

HON. ROBERT W. EDGAR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 10, 1976

Mr. EDGAR. Mr. Speaker, the Public Works and Transportation Committee is reporting H.R. 9560 with a provision which will have an irreversible adverse impact on our Nation's wetlands. This provision, known as the Breaux amendment, was added without hearings before the committee, and is opposed by EPA officials and environmental groups.

On May 7, I inserted into the RECORD a statement of my objections to this amendment. It appears on page E2434 of the daily edition, and I recommend it to my colleagues who desire further clarification about the amendment. The full text of an internal EPA memo analyzing the Breaux amendment is included at the end of my statement.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial addressed to this issue in strong support of the preservation of our wetlands appeared in last Saturday's Washington Post. The editorial points out the threat to the ecology of our wetlands should this amendment become law. I wish to insert it at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

WATCHING OVER THE WETLANDS

The House Public Works Committee may have done environmental groups a favor, in a backhanded way, by voting to block federal regulation of dredging and filling in most of the nation's wetlands. The committee's precipitate action has not only focused more public attention on the threats to valuable marshes, bogs and swamps. It has also compelled the advocates of a broad wetlands protection program to appeal for congressional and public support. The resulting debate may help to clear away some of the confusion and misinformation that have clouded the subject for the past few years.

The current controversy goes back to 1972, when Congress, in the clean water law, extended the Army Corps of Engineers' regulatory powers from navigable waters to "waters of the United States." Apparently some legislators failed to recognize that this change gave the Corps power to regulate dredging and filling operations in all wetlands areas, small creeks, lakes and recreational canals, as well as along commercial